DOCUMENT RESUME

JC 680 422

ED 023 407

By-Coffelt, John J

The Status and Direction of Oklahoma Higher Education.
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City.
Pub Date May 68
Note-56p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.90
Descriptors-*Colleges, Educational Legislation, *Higher Education, *Junior Colleges, *Master Plans, State Legislation, *Universities
Identifiers-*Oklahoma

This report examines the need for long-range, state-level planning in higher education to accommodate rising enrollment, expanding knowledge, and the need for educated manpower. It describes the state's legal provisions and policies for establishing and operating junior and senior colleges and state universities (all directives subject to periodic review and revision). The "selective access" admissions policy should be continued, to encourage each student to seek his best educational environment. For example, (1) junior colleges should retain their open door policy, emphasizing vocational, technical, and adult education, (2) senior colleges should admit students who expect to complete at least a bachelor's degree, and, if stressing technical programs, can have slightly lower admission standards, and (3) universities should concentrate on upper-division, professional, and graduate programs and on research, and should gradually decrease the number of lower-division students by maintaining higher admission standards than the colleges. The report includes other details of the state system, both practical and philosophical, such as self-study projects, transfer policies, and funding. It concludes with a warning against the waste and conflict inevitable among a diversity of state agencies, and urges that the partnership between federal and state agencies be strengthened to prevent their working at cross-purposes. (HH)

JUL 8 1968

the status and direction of..

oklahoma higher education

Guidelines for Policy Decisions

JC 680 422

ED023407

Oklahoma State Regents For Higher Education
State Capitol — Oklahoma City
May, 1968

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

DONALD S. KENNEDY
Chairman, Oklahoma City

CLYDE A. WHEELER
Vice-Chairman, Tulsa

MRS. JEWEL DITMARS
Muskogee

HARRY P. CONROY
Secretary, Duncan

G. ELLIS GABLE
Tulsa

EXALL ENGLISH
Assistant Secretary, Lawton

WILLIAM T. PAYNE
Oklahoma City

R. L. CROWDER, JR.
Tonkawa

JOHN J. VATER, JR.
Enid

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

E. T. DUNLAP
Chancellor

JOHN J. COFFELT
Vice-Chancellor for Research and Planning

DAN S. HOBBS
Educational Programs Officer

JOHN E. CLEEK
Facilities Officer

EDWARD J. COYLE
Budget and Finance Officer

LARRY K. HAYES
Research Associate

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Status and Direction

of

Oklahoma Higher Education

Prepared by

JOHN J. COFFELT

THE OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

State Capitol, Oklahoma City

May, 1968

UNIVERSITY OF CAL
LOS ANGELES

SEP 20 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE F
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

FOREWORD

Oklahoma higher education is facing what may well be the most decisive period in its history. Projections of college enrollments indicate that by the year 1975, institutions in the State System will enroll upwards of 120,000 students and all Oklahoma higher education will be approaching an enrollment of 150,000. In practical terms this means that Oklahoma must accomplish in the next six years what it previously took 60 years to accomplish.

Not only is Oklahoma higher education challenged to build enough classrooms, laboratories and other physical facilities to house this enrollment, it must provide educational programs fitted to the changing world of work. It must produce the skilled manpower that will be needed to service an expanding business and industrial state.

With such prospects and challenges facing Oklahoma higher education in the decade ahead, it is imperative that the total resources and energies of its colleges and universities be marshalled and brought systematically to bear on the educational and logistical problems at hand. Careful and comprehensive planning must precede the establishment of new educational programs and new institutions. Costly duplication and proliferation must be avoided. State-level coordination must provide for the orderly allocation of scarce resources so that each unit within the larger structure can make its maximum contribution to the whole.

In 1962, the State Regents initiated a comprehensive, state-wide survey of Oklahoma higher education for the purpose of obtaining information essential to long-range planning. A total of eight major reports have been completed and published which contain some 89 major recommendations for the improvement of Oklahoma higher education. This report, *Status and Direction of Oklahoma Higher Education,* summarizes and evaluates the progress that has been made in implementing these 89 recommendations, and suggests some future directions for Oklahoma higher education in those areas of responsibility assigned to the State Regents in Article XIII-A of the Oklahoma Constitution. The eight Self-Study reports and this summary report will guide the State Regents as they consider and develop further public policy in the field of higher education.

While the State Regents have sought and used the opinions of many individuals and groups interested in and concerned with higher education, they acknowledge this report as their own expression of the direction that Oklahoma higher education should follow in the decade ahead. They recognize that it does not cover all facets of higher education. For this reason and because of changing needs and emerging new problems, it is imperative that long-range plans be revised periodically. It is the State Regents' intention to conduct continuing studies and to seek the advice and counsel of all segments of the higher education community so that the direction and thrust of their policy decisions will remain sensitive to the changing needs and conditions of Oklahoma.

E. T. Dunlap
Chancellor

Publications of

THE SELF-STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN OKLAHOMA

Report 1, *Organization and Plan for the Self-Study of Higher Education in Oklahoma*, by John J. Coffelt, January, 1962.

Report 2, *Selecting, Retaining and Utilizing Higher Education Faculties in Oklahoma*, by John J. Coffelt, December, 1962.

Report 3, *Oklahoma Higher Education Enrollments and Projections*, by Dan S. Hobbs and John J. Coffelt, February, 1963.

Report 4, *Financing Current Operating Costs of Higher Education in Oklahoma*, by Charles R. Walker and John J. Coffelt, March, 1963.

Report 5, *Physical Facilities for Higher Education in Oklahoma*, by Charles R. Walker and John J. Coffelt, December, 1964.

Report 6, *Medical Education in Oklahoma*, by John J. Coffelt, June, 1965.

Report 7, *Higher Education Opportunities and Needs in Oklahoma*, by Dan S. Hobbs, September, 1965.

Report 8, *Goals for Oklahoma Higher Education*, by John J. Coffelt, Dan S. Hobbs, and A. J. Brumbaugh, Consultant, September, 1966.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

I. The Need for Long-Range Planning 1
- Need for State-Level Planning 2
  - The Enrollment Explosion 3
  - The Information Explosion 3
  - The Need for Educated Manpower 4
- Oklahoma's Structure for Planning 4
  - A "State System" of Higher Education 5
  - Statutory Provisions 6
  - What is Coordination? 8
  - Coordinating Activities 8
    - Research for Planning 9
    - Policy Adoption 9
    - Policy Communication and Implementation 9
  - Relationship with Constituent Institutions 9
  - Relationship with the Legislature 10
  - Relaionship with the Governor 10
  - Relationship with Independent Institutions 11
  - A State-Wide Perspective 11

II. Oklahoma's Progress in Long-Range Planning 12
- The Oklahoma Self-Study of Higher Education 12
  - Studies Not Completed 14
- Progress in the Achievement of Objectives and Recommendations 14
  - Achievement of Objectives 15
  - Achievement of Recommendations 18

III. The Federal Government and State-Level Planning 34
- State Coordination of Federal Programs 35
- The Federal-State Partnership 38
  - Data Collection 38
  - Oklahoma Consortium on Research Development 38
- Conclusion 39

IV. Extending and Strengthening Oklahoma Higher Education 40
- Financing Higher Education 41
- Utilization of Resources 41
- Goals for Higher Education 42
- Future Directions of Higher Education 44

Chapter I

The Need for Long-Range Planning

Oklahoma, perhaps more than any other state, has enjoyed a trenchant policy with respect to the provision of higher education opportunities geographically convenient to its citizens. To understand this commitment, to comprehend the present system of higher education, and to appreciate the need for state-level planning and coordination, it is helpful to have some knowledge of territorial and state history.

What is now the State of Oklahoma was originally comprised not of one territory, but of two: Oklahoma Territory occupied what is now the central and western portions of the state, with the Indian Territory lying to the east. Indian Territory was the home of the Five Civilized Tribes, who by 1860, had evolved a culture which was in many respects superior to that in the surrounding frontier states, a culture which included a rather comprehensive system of education. Each of the Indian nations made early provision for public education, including some higher education. In all, before statehood, there were 45 Indian schools established in the two territories, the majority of which were located in Indian Territory.[1]

It is thus not surprising that one of the initial acts of the First Territorial Legislature in Oklahoma Territory was to provide a system of education for the citizens in central and western Oklahoma equal to that which had already been achieved by the tribal governments in the Indian Territory. Prior to statehood, Oklahoma Territory was operating a state university, a land-grant college, three normal colleges, a Negro land-grant agricultural and normal school, and a university preparatory school.

After statehood, the first few legislatures attempted to balance those institutions in the Oklahoma Territory with an equal network of state institutions in the Indian Territory. How well they succeeded is indicated by the fact that by 1919, a total of 20 institutions had been created, 10 of which were located in Oklahoma,

[1]Edwin C. McReynolds, Alice Marriott, and Estelle Faulconer, *Oklahoma: The Past and the Present*, The University of Oklahoma Press, 1961, p. 208.

and 10 in Indian Territory. Thus, Oklahoma's present system of higher education is actually a synthesis of two parallel systems.

One might well ask, in view of historical events, if the establishment of so vast a system of public colleges and universities really constitutes a genuine commitment of the people to public higher education or whether it is merely a secondary complication arising out of the political horse trading. But the fact that the political bargaining was for colleges and universities rather than some other type of state institution or public accommodation is indicative of the deep respect the early settlers had for education.

This early political bargaining helps to account for the fact that Oklahoma is now among the leading states in the nation with respect to the provision of higher education opportunities for its citizens. With 18 state institutions of higher learning, Oklahoma currently ranks seventh among all states in the ratio of state colleges and universities per 100,000 population.[2] It also accounts for the fact that Oklahoma is now among the leading states in the nation with respect to the proportion of high school graduates who go on to college.

Need for State-Level Planning

In recent years, a significant change has occurred with respect to the structure of public higher education, a change which affects the relationships both within and among institutions of higher learning. Since the mid-fifties, state after state has created an agency, commonly referred to as a "coordinating board," and vested in this new board the specific tasks of coordination and long-range planning. A recent study reports that 17 states have established higher education coordinating agencies since 1955, and presently only 11 states are without some type of state-wide coordinating agency.[3]

The pressures for state-level planning and coordination are many and varied, but they are all closely related to concern for the efficient use of public funds and other resources. If states' resources were unlimited there would be no need to be concerned with unnecessary duplication of programs, inefficient use of physical plant space and faculty, or the expansion of institutions and establishment of

[2]U.S. Office of Education, *Education Directory*, Part 3, Higher Education.

[3]Pliner, Emogene, *Coordination and Planning*, Louisiana Higher Education: 3, Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, Inc., (Baton Rouge, Louisiana), September 1966, pp. 7-12.

new campuses to accommodate enrollment increases. Resources are limited, however, and the public rightfully expects the most effective, the most creative, use of public funds to accomplish public policy for higher education.

In Oklahoma, as in many other states, several influences have significantly affected and complicated the problem of long-range planning for higher education. These include the increased demand for higher education, the state's need for educated manpower, and problems of expanding information and the utilization of that information.

The Enrollment Explosion. Perhaps the most obvious problem facing Oklahoma higher education is that of planning to accommodate all who will want or who will require a college education. Although higher education enrollments can now be projected with considerable accuracy, even college administrators find it difficult to accept the obvious. Yet a review of the state's history of college enrollments should convince even the most skeptical that colleges and universities will be severely challenged to keep abreast of demand.

Oklahoma was 50 years in enrolling its first 25,000 students. Although three state institutions were established in Oklahoma Territory in 1890, it was not until 1940 that as many as 25,000 students were enrolled in the State System. The second 25,000 was enrolled in 1962, just 22 years later; and the third 25,000 was enrolled in 1967, only five years after reaching the second plateau.

Although the rate of increase in college enrollments obviously will not continue indefinitely, it can be estimated with certainty that the fourth 25,000 will be enrolled by 1972, and possibly sooner. By 1975, enrollments in the State System are projected to exceed 120,000; and by 1980, they will be approaching 150,000.

The Information Explosion. Although somewhat less obvious than the enrollment explosion, a problem of equal magnitude is that posed by the rapid expansion, or explosion, of knowledge. It is currently estimated that man's cumulative knowledge is now doubling each decade. This new knowledge has, rather suddenly, thrown up a dramatic challenge to the nation's institutions, for they must retool in order to assume greater responsibilities for preparing men and women for entry into the changing world of work.

What does this "information explosion" mean? In the first place it means that the kinds of jobs which people used to work at are rapidly disappearing, and new jobs are appearing to take their place. Social scientists now say that a young man preparing for entry into the world of work must expect to be retrained as many as three times during his years of gainful employment. It means that the best job prospects will be in those fields which require the greatest amount of education. It means that the whole future of a state and of its citizens is inextricably interwoven with the future of its higher education system.

The Need for Educated Manpower. Only in recent years has the general public come to the realization that a state's economic well-being rests as much upon the development of its human resources as upon its natural resources. A state that does not believe in the importance of its educational system, or that does not provide the resources necessary to educate its young people commensurate with their needs and interests, will not fare well in its competition for industrial growth and expansion. It is true of course that people are more "mobile" today than ever before in the history of the nation, and it is possible for a state to attract some educated manpower through the process of industrial transplants. But managerial talent will not long remain in a culturally deprived area, nor will an industry prosper if its needs for trained manpower are not met.

If Oklahoma is to be successful in its current efforts to attract new industry to the state, and to support the expansion and growth of existing industry, it will need to give renewed attention to strengthening educational opportunities for its citizens. Particularly, it must broaden educational opportunities in vocational and technical fields in order to train the skilled manpower that will be needed. In the academic field, and particularly at the graduate level, it must overcome the quality gap that currently prevails.

Oklahoma's Structure for Planning

Research and planning have long been key words in the business community. Their acceptance in the field of government, and particularly in the field of public education, is a relatively recent development. Since 1955, some seventeen

[4] *Ibid*, pp. 7-12.

states have established state agencies for the purpose of coordinating and planning higher education.[4] This recent concern for the creation of planning agencies has been brought about primarily because of rising educational costs, surging college enrollments, demands for greater efficiency, and concern about the upgrading of quality.

Oklahoma, like many states, is witnessing an upsurge of interest in the problems and needs of higher education and the importance of sound, state-wide planning to meet these needs. Educators, legislators, and the public alike recognize and support systematic research and planning as a basis for the development of sound public policy in the area of higher education. The people have provided, through the creation of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, a structure which apparently has been serving as a model for other states as they move toward increased emphasis upon state-level planning for higher education.[5]

A "State System" of Higher Education

Article XIII-A of the Oklahoma Constitution provides that "All institutions of higher education supported wholly or in part by direct legislative appropriations shall be integral parts of a unified system to be known as 'The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education'." This same Article also provides for the establishment of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as the coordinating board of control for this state system, and vests in it certain specific powers and responsibilities essential to state-level planning and coordination as follows:[6]

1. It shall prescribe standards of higher education applicable to each institution;
2. It shall determine the functions and courses of study in each of the institutions to conform to the standards prescribed;
3. It shall grant degrees and other forms of academic recognition for completion of the prescribed courses in all of such institutions;
4. It shall recommend to the State Legislature the budget allocations to each institution, and;

[5]*Ibid*, pp. 7-12.

[6]Article XIII-A, Section 2, *Constitution of Oklahoma*.

5. It shall have the power to recommend to the Legislature proposed fees for all of such institutions, and any such fees shall be effective only within the limits prescribed by the Legislature.

Section 3 of the Constitution provides that appropriations made by the Legislature for institutions in the State System be made in consolidated form without reference to any particular institution, and that the State Regents shall allocate these funds ". . . to each institution according to its needs and functions." Section 4 provides that private, denominational, and other institutions of higher learning may become coordinated with the State System under regulations set forth by the State Regents.

Statutory Provisions

Vitalizing legislation, adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature, further provides the following powers and duties of the State Regents:[7]

1. Prescribe standards for admission to, retention in, and graduation from state educational institutions;
2. Accept federal funds and grants and use the same in accordance with federal requirements;
3. Accept and disburse grants, gifts, devises, bequests, and other monies and property from foundations, corporations, and individuals;
4. Establish, award, and disburse scholarships and scholarship funds and rewards for merit from any funds available for such purpose;
5. Allocate revolving and other non-state-appropriated educational and general funds;
6. Transfer from one institution to another any property belonging to such institution when no longer needed by it and when needed by another institution to accomplish its functions;
7. Prepare and publish biennially a report to the Governor, the Legislature, and institutions, setting forth the progress, needs, and recommendations of state educational institutions and of the State Regents;

[7]Title 70, *Oklahoma Statutes*, 1965 Supplement, Section 3206.

8. Conduct studies, surveys and research projects to gather information about the needs of state educational institutions and make such additional reports and recommendations as it deems necessary or as the Governor or the Legislature may direct, and publish such information obtained as may be considered worthy of dissemination;

9. Exercise all powers necessary or convenient to accomplish the purposes and objectives of Article XIII-A, of the Constitution of Oklahoma.

The concept envisioned by those who framed Article XIII-A of the Constitution of Oklahoma was that state institutions would form a "system" of higher education with all institutions acting in concert to provide the people with appropriate higher education opportunities. Both the constitutional amendment and vitalizing legislation recognize that there should be a systematic division of responsibilities among constituent institutions. The law intends that there be broad educational opportunity, but with a minimum of unnecessary duplication and proliferation so as to achieve maximum use of resources. Broadly stated, it is the responsibility of the State Regents to determine institutional functions and educational programs, prescribe standards of education, grant degrees, and allocate resources.

The Constitution and Statutes also provide for a governing board for each institution in the State System, although some governing boards have responsibility for more than one institution. Governing boards are responsible for the operation and management of institutions, including employment of personnel, custody of records, contracting for services, acquisition and custody of property, budget administration, academic and student life programs, and auxiliary enterprises.

Implicit in this arrangement is the need for mutual confidence and understanding between the coordinating board and the governing boards. For the State System to operate effectively, the coordinating board must have sufficient authority to fulfill its responsibilities; it must have a capable professional staff; and it must have a state-wide perspective with respect to higher education problems and needs. Governing boards also must have sufficient authority to operate institutions, to staff them with capable people, and to do those things necessary

to achieve institutional purposes. The successful operation of the State System requires close liaison and effective communication between the coordinating and governing boards. Each must understand and respect the other's particular responsibilities.

What is Coordination?

The Constitution of Oklahoma establishes the State Regents as the "coordinating board of control" of the State System. Powers of the coordinating board are both expressed and implied in the Constitution, including the conduct of research, the establishment of broad higher education goals for the State System, and the accomplishment of state-level planning for appropriate division of responsibility and the allocation of resources among institutions. While the Constitution provides for the responsibilities of the coordinating board of control, it does not define the term "coordination." The terms "coordinate" and "coordination" are defined in Webster's Dictionary to have various meanings, including (1) to regulate and combine in harmonious action; (2) harmonious adjustment or functioning; and (3) to bring into proper order or relation. The term is interpreted by the State Regents as follows:

> *Coordination is the planning for and systematic allocation of responsibility and resources among institutions to promote maximum efficiency and effectiveness in the achievement of higher education goals.*

While coordination arises out of some form of regulation and careful overview, at the same time it does not follow that all coordination is the result of compulsion. Coordination should be essentially positive in that it seeks to provide for appropriate division of institutional responsibility and the orderly allocation of scarce resources so that each institution within the State System can make its maximum contribution to the whole.

Coordinating Activities

Coordination of higher education involves three basic activities. These are: (1) research and planning, (2) policy formulation, and (3) policy communication

and implementation. All three activities are continuous, and each is inseparable from the others.

Research for Planning. The focal activity of state-level coordination in higher education is the formulation of goals and the development of a comprehensive, long-range plan for their achievement. Systematic planning involves a continuous reassessment of these goals, of progress toward the goals, and periodic revision of the plans to keep the two in harmony. Thus, long-range planning involves continuous research and study in order that planning will be based upon a realistic appraisal of the current condition as well as future needs of higher education. Without factual information on which to base judgments, planning will be ineffective.

Policy Adoption. The obvious outcome of planning is the adoption of appropriate public policy with respect to meeting the needs of higher education. Such policy should be based upon thorough research, should take into consideration both existing and future needs of the citizens of the state, and should be consistent with long-range goals for Oklahoma higher education.

Policy Communication and Implementation. There is little value in planning and formulating policy for higher education if these plans and policies are subsequently ignored by those responsible for their implementation. The judicious communication and implementation of such policy, therefore, is a third important activity of coordination.

Relationship with Constituent Institutions

The planning and execution of state policy for higher education necessarily depends upon continuing, harmonious association with institutions and other constituent agencies that comprise the State System. It is imperative that such association not impose inappropriate constraints upon these institutions and agencies. The responsibility for institutional management resides with the governing board, administration, and faculty of the institution; and the coordinating agency must exercise due care that the implementation of state-level policy does not impose unnecessary restrictions or limitations which hamper the fulfillment of

institutional responsibilities. Freedom of inquiry, institutional initiative, and administrative flexibility are important elements that must be protected.

The success of coordination will depend upon a clear understanding of interrelationships between the coordinating board and those responsible for institutional management. It is imperative, therefore, that these relationships be clearly developed and properly communicated to all persons involved. Mutual goodwill and a broad sense of common purpose and destiny must be maintained between the coordinating and operating levels of the state system of higher education. Coordination must recognize institutional prerogatives; but it must also zealously guard its own prerogatives.

Relationship with the Legislature

The legislative branch of government has the power to decide state appropriations and the power to enact other vitalizing laws with respect to higher education. The coordinating board has the responsibility to recommend to the legislature the budgetary needs of institutions, but the legislature has the power to determine the amount of the appropriation provided for the State System. Therefore, it is important that the coordinating board establish and maintain appropriate communication with the legislative branch of government. The legislature should be kept fully and completely informed with respect to higher education needs and problems. These needs and problems should be carefully documented with factual reports that accurately present the full picture.

Relationship with the Governor

As Chief Executive, the Governor has broad responsibility regarding the total welfare of the state, including higher education opportunities for the people. He approves appropriations and other legislation affecting higher education enacted by the Legislature and makes appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of the coordinating board. As provided in his constitutional responsibilities, the Governor also submits a budget proposal to the Legislature which includes all services of state government. It is important, therefore, that the State Regents keep the Governor fully informed regarding the problems and needs of Oklahoma

higher education, results of pertinent research and study, and their recommendation for solutions.

Relationship with Independent Institutions

Distinct advantages accrue to the people of Oklahoma from the presence of both independent and state-supported institutions of higher education. Each type of institution has made and is making notable contributions to social progress by providing a wide range of educational opportunities for varied individual needs. Because independent institutions have a vested interest in Oklahoma's future, and because they complement the state system of higher education, their plans and objectives should be taken into consideration in state-wide planning. Wherever appropriate, state and independent institutions should work together to achieve maximum coordination for all Oklahoma higher education.

A State-Wide Perspective

As the coordinating board of control for The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education, the State Regents are responsible for formulating policy with respect to those powers vested in them by Article XIII-A of the Constitution of the State of Oklahoma. The State Regents may initiate the formulation of policy, or their policy actions may be in response to official communications directed to them from constituent institutions. The State Regents endeavor to maintain a state-wide perspective on all policy matters brought before them and to maintain consistency and continuity with respect to goals for long-range development of Oklahoma higher education.

Chapter II

Oklahoma's Progress in Long-Range Planning

Oklahoma, like many other states, is experiencing an upsurge of interest in the problems and needs of higher education and in the necessity for sound, statewide planning to meet those needs. In an effort to project solutions to impending problems before they arise, to avoid an unending race to "catch up," the State Regents initiated a comprehensive self-study of Oklahoma higher education late in 1961. The primary objective of this study was to develop a broad plan, or design, which would provide direction and continuity for the day-to-day policy decisions that must be made by the State Regents, the Legislature, governing boards, and other public bodies and officials in fulfilling their legal responsibilities.

The Oklahoma Self-Study of Higher Education

The first step taken by the State Regents was to develop a plan for conducting the study. That plan provided not only a format for conducting the study, but also set forth its purposes and objectives, the scope of the undertaking, and suggestions for its ultimate use.[8] Specific purposes of the self-study were (1) to identify the needs in Oklahoma for education beyond the high school, (2) to inventory and analyze resources (programs, staffs, finances, and facilities) currently available to meet the needs, and (3) to determine ways in which current and probable additional resources might best be used to achieve broad objectives.

The second step was to conduct a series of studies relating to seven major "problem areas" identified in the self-study plan. These major areas were (1) functions and goals for Oklahoma higher education, (2) control and administration, (3) higher education enrollments and projections, (4) higher education opportunities and needs, (5) selecting, retaining and utilizing higher education faculties and administrative personnel, (6) physical facilities of higher education, and (7) financing current operating costs of higher education in Oklahoma. During the course of the study an eighth area was added, medical education in Oklahoma.

The purpose of these problem area surveys was to obtain quantitative data about

[8]Coffelt, John J., *Organization and Plan—Report* 1, Self-Study of Higher Education in Oklahoma, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, State Capitol, Oklahoma City, January, 1962.

higher education problems and needs in the state which would be of value in evaluating impending problems and needs, and in projecting desirable solutions for them.

Between 1962 and 1966, eight problem area reports were completed and published by the State Regents. Each of these reports was an "in depth" analysis of a problem area, and each contained a series of recommendations for the improvement of Oklahoma higher education. It was anticipated at the outset that these problem area reports would be completed within 24 to 36 months and that a final report would be made in the fall of 1965 or spring of 1966.

As the study progressed, however, several events occurred which necessitated a modification of the original target dates. A major factor in the delay of the study was the need to implement certain recommendations in advance of the completion of the total project. Because of pressures both within and external to the State System, it became necessary to invest a disproportionately large block of the research staff's time in related side studies essential to policy decisions facing the State Regents. For example, the urgency for a state plan to administer the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and to allocate state funds for capital construction were so pressing that it became necessary to delay the Self-Study in order to implement the recommendation with respect to the development of a State System Capital Budgeting Program. Had not the State Regents moved immediately to develop this program, the state would have lost several millions of dollars in federal funds made available to Oklahoma in Public Law 88-204.

A second occurrence which unavoidably delayed the Self-Study was the tensions created within the State System as certain of the recommendations were implemented by the State Regents. Actions to implement recommendations inevitably produce stress within a system of higher education, and particularly within those institutions directly affected by the recommendations. Because the plan of the Self-Study involved people attached to institutions touched by the implementation of certain recommendations, this stress hampered the achievement of institutional concensus and solidarity in the latter stages of the study.

A third factor not anticipated at the outset was the unavoidable turnover in the

State Regents' research staff, in institutional and legislative leadership, and in the membership of the State Regents and operating boards. The need for continuous orientation of new faces which had been elevated to leadership positions posed procedural problems that were not easily overcome.

Studies Not Completed. Of the seven major problem areas included in the Self-Study research was completed and reports published on all but one area, that of control and administration of Oklahoma higher education. This study area had been left until last and when it became evident that an objective evaluation of the planning and administrative structure could not be accomplished, the State Regents concluded that it should be completed by a group external to the State System.

The Second Session of the Thirty-First Oklahoma Legislature has adopted House Concurrent Resolution No. 559 directing the appointment of a ten-member legislative committee to study the present system of boards of regents governing the colleges and universities of the state. During 1968, this committee will conduct such a study and prepare a report to the First Session of the Thirty-Second Oklahoma Legislature. The State Regents have expressed their intention to cooperate fully with this legislative committee in its study and deliberation of the Oklahoma higher education structure.

Other studies held in abeyance are those of other budget agencies in the State System. These include the Geological Survey, the College of Veterinary Medicine, Agricultural Experiment Station, Agricultural Extension Division, and School of Technical Training at Okmulgee. Data compiled on these budget agencies have been useful to the State Regents in improving the State Regents' formula for determining their budgetary needs.

Progress in the Achievement of Objectives and Recommendations

Despite these and other limitations, however, substantial progress has been made in implementing many elements of Oklahoma's emerging long-range plan for higher education. In light of questions raised from time to time as to the

efficacy of certain recommendations, as well as to the Self-Study itself, an evaluation of progress appears timely. This evaluation is desirable not only to ascertain the progress in implementing certain recommendations, but also should provide the basis for judging the feasibility of certain recommendations and the need for modifying and/or adding others.

Achievement of Objectives. Table 1 on the following page summarizes the specific objectives set forth in the State Regents' plan for conducting the Self-Study, and comments on the extent to which these objectives have been achieved. Because some of the objectives are such that will require continuing study and action, it is perhaps misleading to indicate that they have been "achieved." In terms of original intentions and expectations, however, it is fair to record the achievement of nearly all of the study objectives.

Particularly noteworthy is the extent of improvements accomplished with respect to budget building procedures and criteria for the State System. Of particular concern to the State Regents, as well as institutional officials and legislators, was the inadequacy of budget building procedures being used prior to the initiation of the Self-Study. Major criticisms being leveled at the formula were that it was too insensitive to individual functions of institutions, to new needs, and to certain high cost instructional programs such as graduate education and research. Following are the basic modifications that have been made as a result of study and research in this area of State Regents' responsibilities.

Changes in Procedures

1. The adoption of "guiding principles" for use in recognizing the direction and extent of emphasis to be given various functions and programs in the budget development process. These guiding principles, adopted each year *in advance of* institutional budget hearings and the development of the budget request, provide the basis for modification of emphasis on various programs.

2. The initiation of budget hearings. Each institution in the State System is invited to appear before the State Regents at a meeting particularly set

TABLE 1

Objectives of the Oklahoma Self-Study of Higher Education

Objective	Progress
1. To formulate a statement of goals for Oklahoma higher education.	1. Achieved.
2. To develop uniform inter-institutional definitions and reporting procedures in order that comparable data on enrollments, programs, finances, facilities, and other aspects of higher education can be obtained which are basic to state-wide analysis and planning.	2. Achieved in the area of enrollments, programs, and facilities. An accounting principles and procedures manual is curently in preparation.
3. To describe in as much detail as possible the characteristics of higher education in Oklahoma and of the individual institutions.	3. Achieved.
4. To analyze higher education enrollment trends in Oklahoma and estimate future enrollments.	4. Achieved.
5. To study existing student admission, retention, and graduation policies and practices, and appraise possible need for changes.	5. Achieved in the areas of admissions and retention. Studies in the area of graduation policies and practices have not been accomplished.
6. To study and determine possible ways of improving budget building procedures and methods of allocating state appropriations.	6. Achieved. Eleven basic changes have been made in the budget criteria. Individual institutional budget hearings have been instituted. Budget allocations have been patterned after budget requests, and a reserve for unanticipated enrollment growth has been established.
7. To project the extent of probable financial needs of higher education from the present to 1975.	7. Achieved.
8. To inventory higher education opportunities in Oklahoma; determine what programs are not available; identify those programs which are available but inadequate; and study the extent of unnecessary duplication.	8. Achieved.
9. To study ways of selecting, retaining, and more effectively utilizing higher education faculties.	9. Achieved.
10. To appraise the adequacy in quantity and quality of present institutional facilities and examine ways to utilize physical plants more effectively.	10. Achieved. Utilization standards have been developed and studies of space use made annually. A state system capital outlay budgeting program has been developed and implemented.
11. To aid each institution in better understanding itself and its role in higher education, and encourage continued improvement in the quality and effectiveness of institutional programs and services.	11. Partially achieved. Functions of each institution are curently being redefined; this has been accomplished for four institutions.

for this purpose, and to present its recommendations with respect to budget needs for the ensuing fiscal year.

3. When adopted by the State Regents, the operating budget for the State System is printed and distributed widely to institutions, legislators, governing board members, and others interested in and concerned with the budget request. This report sets forth in detail the budget procedures followed, budget criteria used, and calculation of each institution's budget needs.

Changes in Criteria

1. Enrollment:—Enrollment projections are now made *for each institution* whereas previously an average state-wide enrollment increase was made for all institutions.
2. Enrollment:—The definition of "full-time-equivalent" enrollment was changed from total semester-credit-hours divided by 15, to total undergraduate semester-credit-hours divided by 15, and total graduate semester-hours divided by 12.
3. Enrollment:—Projected full-year FTE enrollment is used to determine the budget base whereas previously fall term data were used and each institution was allowed a factor for summer term faculty salaries.
4. Enrollment:—Eliminated the minimum FTE base allowed different types of institutions.
5. Faculty:—Established recommended student-faculty ratios *by level of instruction* rather than by type of institution.
6. Faculty:—Utilized regional and national salary data in order to arrive at salary recommendations, which establishes salary recommendations for each type of institution which are competitive for that institutional type.
7. Faculty:—Established special student-faculty ratio for institutions assigned the primary function of providing technical education, to recognize the greater cost of this particular function.

8. Budget Functions:—Adopted eight functional categories in order to bring Oklahoma's functional classification in line with the recommendations of the National Committee on Standard Reports.

9. Factors:—Adopted Russell "guidelines" as the primary basis for determining the budget requirements for budget functions other than "Instruction."

10. Factors:—Modified factors to provide fiscal emphasis to functions recognized in the guiding principles as needing particular emphasis.

11. Estimating Income:—Estimated each institution's non-state-appropriated income whereas previously each institution was charged with a percentage of the budget recommendation which that institution was expected to generate.

Achievement of Recommendations. In their organization and plan for conducting the Oklahoma Self-Study of Higher Education, the State Regents adopted the premise that, "The really important aspect of the Self-Study is what subsequently happens regarding the improvement of Oklahoma higher education." They recognized at the outset that research and study, regardless of how well it might be done, would be of little value unless the recommendations were implemented. In their plan, the State Regents also recognized that many of the recommendations would likely be directed to other boards, to the Oklahoma Legislature, to the Governor, and in some instances, to the people. Thus the full implementation of recommendations would require the cooperative effort of several groups.

Eight basic reports were published by the State Regents as part of the Oklahoma Self-Study of Higher Education, seven of which contained recommendations for the improvement and strengthening of higher education. Altogether, a total of 89 recommendations was made. As a first step in the development of a long-range master plan for Oklahoma higher education, it is important to take stock of these recommendations to determine the extent of their implementation, the continued validity of those not yet implemented, and the extent to which these recommendations (which dealt with specific problem areas) suggest broader recommendations for improving the quality and effectiveness of Oklahoma higher education.

TABLE 2

Summary of Progress in Implementing the Oklahoma Self-Study Recommendations

REPORT 2 – HIGHER EDUCATION FACULTIES

Recommendation 1: Faculty and administrative salaries in Oklahoma state colleges and universities should be adjusted upward immediately in order to bring them in line with those of comparable institutions in surrounding states.	**Not Implemented.** Since 1962, average faculty salaries in the State System have increased from $6,761 to $9,716. However, regional salary averages have increased proportionately, and Oklahoma faculty salaries are still substantially below regional and national averages.*
Recommendation 2: The provision of adequate funds should be undertaken immediately to improve faculty salaries in the privately controlled institutions in Oklahoma.	**Not Determined.** Annual statistics are not compiled by the State Regents with respect to faculty salaries at private and municipal institutions.
Recommendation 3: Governing boards of institutions in the State System should give priority to raising the salary levels of faculty members who hold senior academic rank.	**Partially Implemented.** Salary averages for faculty holding senior academic rank have increased substantially in comparison with those holding junior rank.
Recommendation 4: Governing boards of institutions in the State System should maintain a reasonable balance in the averages of faculty salaries in institutions of like type and function.	**Not Implemented.** Significant variations still occur in the average salary paid at institutions of like type and function.
Recommendation 5: Oklahoma colleges and universities should expand and intensify their efforts to find more effective ways of utilizing faculty resources.	**Partially Implemented.** Several institutions are experimenting with television, individualized study, larger classes, and other efforts to improve the utilization of faculty resources.
Recommendation 6: Those institutions which presently maintain unusually low faculty productivity levels should carefully consider the economic impact of such practices and investigate the desirability of effecting substantial savings in instructional manpower by raising the student-credit-hour productivity of the faculty. The one or two institutions that maintain unusually high faculty productivity levels should review their staffing program to make certain that such practices are not diluting the quality of instruction.	**Substantially Implemented.** A large number of small classes have been eliminated. Institutions with high faculty productivity have not been able to reduce these heavy teaching loads, however, because of lack of educational and general operating funds.
Recommendation 7: College administrators should conduct careful institutional studies of faculty turnover for the purpose of reducing the loss of young faculty members and particularly the loss of those individuals who have demonstrated the greatest potential for professional development.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit the evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.

*Note: At a special meeting on May 17, 1968, the State Regents adopted Resolution 484 directing each institution in the State System to expend its "new funds" to achieve regional salary averages and employ additional full-time faculty.

Recommendation 8: The distribution of faculty ranks at most institutions should be maintained at approximately the present levels. The two or three institutions that have a high proportion of their faculties holding senior academic rank should consider bringing the proportion in closer harmony with desirable levels as they plan and implement future staffing patterns. The two or three colleges that have a low proportion of their faculties holding senior academic rank should seek to strengthen their faculty by the recruitment of teachers qualified to hold senior academic rank.	**Implemented.** A comparison of current faculty rank distributions with those reported in 1962, indicates that appropriate balances are currently being maintained at all institutions in the State System.
Recommendation 9: Special administrative effort should be directed toward maintaining, and where possible strengthening, the quality of the higher education faculties of Oklahoma colleges and universities.	**Not Determined.** Follow-up studies have not been made which would permit an evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 10: The state universities should carefully review their current staffing patterns with respect to the proportion of part-time faculty members that carry the institution's instructional load.	**Not Implemented.** Budget data for the 1967-68 Fiscal Year indicate that the proportion of part-time faculty members carrying the instructional load at the two state universities has increased.
Recommendation 11: The teaching faculties of the municipal junior colleges should be strengthened by greatly increasing the proportion of teachers who devote their full time and energies to the junior college program.	**Not Determined.** Follow-up studies have not been made which would permit the evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 12: The governing board and administrative staff of each state institution should carefully review institutional policies and faculty practices regarding extra teaching assignments and non-institutional employment, to make certain that such activities are in no way imposing upon the primary duties and responsibilities of the teaching staff.	**Not Determined.** Follow-up studies have not been made which would permit the evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 13: The governing board and administrative staff of each institution should remain alert to the danger of excessive educational inbreeding and as new faculty members are added effort should be made to maintain good balance in diversity of educational background and experiences.	**Not Determined.** Follow-up studies have not been made which would permit the evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 14: Oklahoma institutions should join hands with other colleges and universities across the nation in encouraging the more promising students to choose a college teaching career.	**Not Determined.** Follow-up studies have not been made which would permit the evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.

REPORT 3 – ENROLLMENTS AND PROJECTIONS

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that long-range plans be developed which will insure that every Oklahoma resident who wants to enroll in college and who can meet admission standards will have access to an institution in the State System.	**Substantially Implemented.** Long - range goals have been adopted consistent with this recommendation, and admissions policies for state institutions have been adopted which are compatible with this recommendation. Financial aid programs for students have been established to assist economically deprived youth.
Recommendation 2: It is recommended that as enrollments rise and facilities become more crowded, state-supported colleges and universities give priority to the admission of qualified Oklahoma residents.	**Substantially Implemented.** Improved utilization of physical plant space and the construction of additional facilities have prevented the need to limit the admission of out-of-state enrollments.
Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the State Regents and governing boards, in order to provide opportunity to all eligible students to go on to college, make maximum use of existing facilities of the State System before providing new facilities which duplicate those already in existence.	**Implemented.** Criteria for the establishment of new community college campuses provides that existing programs not be duplicated.
Recommendation 4: It is recommended that Oklahoma colleges and universities direct greater attention toward youth who are dropping out of college in an effort to identify and retain promising students who may be discontinuing their college education.	**Partially Implemented.** Several institutions have made, or currently have under way, studies directed toward this problem. A "counselors' guide" is being prepared to assist in counseling students toward institutions best suited to their needs and interests.
Recommendation 5: It is recommended that college officials institute a systematic administrative procedure to make certain that all regularly admitted college freshmen have participated in the American College Testing Program.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit the evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 6: It is recommended that uniform policies be adopted with respect to the transfer of students among colleges and universities in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.	**Not Implemented.** Although some institutions have worked cooperatively to achieve uniformity, a written policy on student transfer has not yet been developed.
Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the State Regents continue to compile annual statistics on higher education enrollments similar to those presented in this report so that up-to-date and reliable information will be available for continuous long-range planning.	**Implemented.** Statistics are regularly and systematically compiled, analyzed, and published with respect to higher education enrollments, and enrollment projections are updated annually.

REPORT 4 – HIGHER EDUCATION FINANCE

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that immediate attention be given to raising the level of income of state colleges and universities in Oklahoma in order to meet more adequately the basic operational needs of those institutions.	**Partially Implemented.** Between 1961 - 62 and 1967-68, total expenditures for higher education in the State System increased by 97.1 percent. Whereas absolute gains have been substantial, however, they have not been as significant relative to gains experienced in surrounding states.

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that the need for more adequate financing of privately controlled higher education institutions in Oklahoma be recognized and that efforts of those institutions to obtain more adequate funds receive the enthusiastic support of individuals and groups typically called upon to finance the costs of private institutions of higher learning.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit an evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 3: It is recommended that municipal junior colleges in Oklahoma either be adequately financed or be phased out of existence as a part of the higher education structure.	**Partially Implemented.** Legislation has been enacted establishing in principal, the provision of state support to municipal (community) junior colleges, and some funds were appropriated to these institutions in the 1967-68 Fiscal Year.
Recommendation 4: It is recommended that a more uniform financial accounting classification and reporting system be developed for institutions in the State System and that a manual of accounting be prepared which provides college officials with a compilation of the laws, regulations, and other requirements with respect to the collection, depositing, disbursement, proper accounting for, and standardization of reporting of all institutional funds. The State Regents should provide the leadership in implementing this recommendation as rapidly as possible.	**Substantially Implemented.** A uniform financial accounting classification and reporting system has been developed for institutions in the State System, and a manual of accounts is currently being prepared by the State Regents.
Recommendation 5: Those institutions which presently maintain unusually low expenditure levels for the libraries function should carefully review the effect of such fiscal policies upon the quality of instruction. As additional funds become available to those institutions, priority should be given to more adequate financing of libraries.	**Substantially Implemented.** Between 1961-62 and 1967-68, budgeted expenditures for libraries in the State System have increased in excess of 120 per cent, whereas the increase for all budget functions has been 97.1 per cent. The State Regents' formula for the development of operating budget needs for the State System has been modified to provide greater support for libraries.
Recommendation 6: It is recommended that institutions which tend to put abnormally high percentages of educational and general revenues into operation and maintenance of the physical plant should conduct careful institutional studies to determine the reasons for deviations from suggested standards.	**Partially Implemented.** Several institutions which reported high expenditures for physical plant have reduced substantially the proportion of their educational and general budget expended for this budget function. Others, however, still maintain relatively high expenditure levels for physical plant operation.
Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the formula used by the State Regents in arriving at budgetary needs of institutions in the State System (1) make greater recognition of the differences in cost by level of instruction and (2) make use of full-year FTE enrollments. The State Regents should continue to work toward improvement of the formula so that a more accurate determination of the financial needs of institutions might be made.	**Implemented.** Eleven major changes have been made in the formula subsequent to the Self-Study report on financing higher education in Oklahoma. Included in these changes were modifications to give greater recognition of the difference in cost levels of instruction, and use of full-year FTE enrollment.

Recommendation 8: It is recommended that costs to the student in state colleges and universities be kept as low as possible in order that all Oklahoma youth capable of benefiting from higher education may have a better opportunity to continue their education beyond high school. Required fees should not exceed those of state institutions in surrounding states and institutions should be discouraged from imposing further special fees and charges as a means of financing operating budgets.

Not Implemented. In May of 1966, the State Regents increased the General Enrollment Fee by approximately 28 per cent, and in May of 1967, increased it again by approximately 30 per cent. The proportion of Education and General Income from student fees and tuition has increased from 23.0 per cent in 1962-63, to 33.0 per cent in 1967-68. It should be noted, however, that student charges have also increased at state institutions in surrounding states, and student fees at Oklahoma institutions are approximately at the median for comparable institutions.

Recommendation 9: It is recommended that the State Regents modify their present policy so that not less than three-fourths of the income from the General Fee should be used for the Educational and General Operations Budget. It is also recommended that all income from any future increases in the General Fee that are assessed for the purpose of improving the instructional program be placed in the educational and general budget.

Implemented. In May of 1963, the State Regents modified their policy statement on the use of General Enrollment Fee income to provide that at least 75 per cent of it must be used for Educational and General purposes. In May of 1966, it was further amended to provide that at least 81 per cent must be used for this purpose. In June of 1967, separate fees were authorized for the support of student activities, and institutions were directed to use 100 per cent of the General Enrollment Fee for Educational and General purposes.

Recommendation 10: It is recommended that the State Regents compile and publish a list of all student fees that each state institution is currently authorized to charge, and that the compilation of authorized fees be kept up-to-date as subsequent changes are authorized by the State Regents.

Implemented. In May of 1963, the State Regents compiled a list of authorized student charges for each institution in the State System. The list of authorized student charges was published, and is now revised and republished annually.

Recommendation 11: It is recommended that the State Regents continue to compile, analyze, and disseminate higher education financial data similar to that presented in this and supplementary documents in order that up-to-date and reliable information will be available for continuous, long-range planning.

Implemented. The State Regents' office compiles, analyzes and publishes annual studies on income and expenditures at institutions in the State System. These data provide a basis for annual evaluation of the operating budget needs of institutions in the State System. They are also widely disseminated for use by administrators, board members, legislators, and other such groups.

REPORT 5 – PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the Legislature and the people of Oklahoma authorize a state bond issue for college construction sufficient to meet the needs of The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education as projected to the year 1970. For the 18 colleges and universities in the State System, construction needs projected to 1970 total $40,825,712.

Implemented. At a special election on December 14, 1965, the citizens of Oklahoma approved State Question #443 which authorized a bond issue for capital construction in the amount of $54,750,000, of which $38,500,000 was for higher education. These funds, together with federal funds, have permitted the full implementation of Phase I of the state's higher education capital construction program.

Recommendation 2: It is further recommended that the following order of priority guide the State Regents in allocating these funds to institutions in the State System.

a. To meet current deferred maintenance and alteration needs, thereby restoring existing physical plant space classified as poor and unsatisfactory to a satisfactory condition.
b. To replace unsatisfactory space which this report recommends be abandoned and replaced.
c. To provide "catch up" space which is pointed out in this report as being needed.
d. To provide additional new space estimated to be required to provide for enrollment increases projected to occur by 1970.

Implemented. In carrying out Phase I of the State Regents' capital improvements program, priority guides as recommended in the Self-Study were adopted and carefully followed. Deviations from these guides were authorized only after subsequent surveys revealed justifiable reasons for their modification.

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the State Regents develop a "capital budget program" for submission to the 1967 Oklahoma Legislature (and biennially thereafter) which, with such federal funds as may be available, will enable the state to move toward the construction of physical plant space needed by 1975, and thereafter, on a "pay-as-you-go" basis.

Substantially Implemented. During 1967, the State Regents completed the survey of physical facility needs in the State System for Phase II, which projects needs through 1975. This program was submitted to the Second Session of the Thirty-First Oklahoma Legislature in February, 1968. No action has yet been taken to adopt the "pay-as-you-go" principal for funding capital outlay needs.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that each institution immediately develop and periodically up-date a master plan for long-range campus development. Such a master plan should project current and future physical plant needs, provide for the "functional" location of new space in relation to existing buildings, and identify building priorities. This plan should serve as a guide for implementing results of the physical plant survey of needs of each institution.

Implemented. All institutions in the State System have developed written master plans for long-range campus development. These plans are modified periodically, and provide the basis for the allocation of capital construction funds. The State Plan for administration of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 provides additional scoring points for institutions having an acceptable long-range plan for institutional development and this has been instrumental in the encouragement of private institutions to develop such plans.

Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the State Regents more adequately fulfill its coordinating responsibilities with respect to physical plant planning and capital budgeting, and that it work cooperatively with each institution in the State System in developing comprehensive, long-range campus plans. It is further recommended that future allocations of capital funds be based on such planning, with funds allocated where the greatest needs exist.

Implemented. The allocation of state funds for capital construction has been coordinated with the State Plan for the Higher Education Facilities Act, and the State Regents serve as the State Commission for the Act. Built into this plan is a project scoring system which gives funding priority on the basis of need as reflected by enrollment growth and level of utilization of existing space.

Recommendation 6: It is recommended that periodic space studies be made by the State Regents and that such data be a basic consideration in the allocation of capital outlay funds for the construction of new academic space.

Implemented. Space utilization studies are made each fall, and provide the basis for scoring of applications for state and federal capital construction funds.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that a high priority be given the construction of additional needed library space when funds become available for new construction.	**Implemented.** In Phase I, 13 institutions planned library projects. Approved campus profiles included plans to construct 280,000 sq. ft. of library space at an estimated cost of $8.3 millions.
Recommendation 8: It is recommended that greater attention be directed toward better structural design in future college buildings and that competent, continuous inspection be given throughout the construction period to make certain that structural adequacy is achieved.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit an evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 9: It is recommended that each institution make a thorough study of the light and color conditions in each building on the campus, particularly the classrooms, teaching laboratories, and offices. A planned program of improvement should be developed to remedy inadequate visual conditions, and high priority should be assigned this project in the administration of the institution's physical plant improvement program.	**Partially Implemented.** As part of the 1965 updating of the 1963 Physical Plant Needs survey, surveys of lighting conditions were made, and reassessed remodeling needs were incorporated into building remodeling needs funded in Phase I. The need for comprehensive light surveys still exists on several campuses, however.
Recommendation 10: It is recommended that each institution in the State System maintain an up-to-date inventory of each room and each building on the campus. Such inventory record should include information as the construction date and cost, square feet of assignable space, primary use, and other information essential to periodic utilization studies. The inventory should also include the equipment owned by the institution.	**Implemented.** A room inventory is maintained for each institution in the State System, and is updated during the Fall semester of each year. This room inventory contains data needed for making space utilization studies and projections of space needs. This inventory does not, however, include movable or fixed equipment.
Recommendation 11: It is recommended that Oklahoma move toward a more complete year-round operation of its colleges and universities.	**Partially Implemented.** All institutions now operate summer terms, and one institution has adopted a trimester calendar.
Recommendation 12: It is recommended that institutions give immediate attention to improving the housekeeping and custodial program on the campus, particularly in college dormitories.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit an evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 13: It is recommended that institutions provide private offices for all full-time faculty.	**Substantially Implemented.** High priority was given the construction of adequate faculty office space in the construction program.
Recommendation 14: It is recommended that future state-wide studies be made of capital items not included in this study. Such items as equipment, utility service facilities, streets, tennis courts, and other non-structural facilities should be evaluated in terms of their adequacy.	**Partially Implemented.** Utility service facility needs were included in the 1965 updating survey for several campuses. Not yet completed are surveys of equipment needs, streets, and other non-structural needs.

REPORT 5 (continued)

Recommendation 15: It is recommended that those institutions which share in the distribution of Section 13 and New College Funds carefully plan and budget these capital funds on a fiscal year basis. It is further recommended that the institutions not now sharing in these revenues be provided a commensurate amount of funds through a biennial budget program.	**Not Implemented.** No changes have been made with respect to the budgeting of these funds or the provision of commensurate amounts to institutions not having access to such funds.
Recommendation 16: It is recommended that high priority be given the development of a new water supply system for Langston University from such funds as may be made available to that institution to meet capital outlay needs.	**Substantially Implemented.** Funds have been allocated and alloted by the State Regents for the completion of a water supply system for Langston University. However, local matching funds have not yet become available.
Recommendation 17: It is recommended that a contingency reserve fund for capital construction in the amount of $2,500,000 be made available, in addition to the amount previously recommended as necessary for capital outlay needs, to meet specific physical plant deficiencies which may not be adequately recognized in this study of gross physical plant needs.	**Implemented.** The State Regents' capital construction program for Phase I set aside a reserve to provide for (1) reductions in the level of federal matching, (2) projects not qualifying for federal funds, and (3) campuses that had not yet completed campus master plans. Recommendations for Phase II also contain recommendations for a "contingency reserve."

REPORT 6 – MEDICAL EDUCATION

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that immediate attention be given to raising the level of income available to the Medical Center for the support of its Educational and General Operating Budget.	**Partially Implemented.** A major increase in current operating funds was recommended for the 1965-67 budget, and implemented to the extent of state appropriations made available. However, legislative appropriations have lagged far behind the State Regents' budget requests.
Recommendation 2: It is recommended that the State Regents develop a written policy statement clearly setting forth the functions of the Medical Center and the programs it is authorized to provide, and that this written policy statement be kept up-to-date as subsequent changes in functions and programs are authorized by the State Regents.	**Not Implemented.** The development of a written statement of the functions of each institution and constituent agency in the State System is currently under way, and such a statement for the OU Medical Center should be developed within the next year. These statements are developed with the cooperation of institutional representatives.
Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the faculty and administration of the Medical Center develop a carefully conceived statement of overall objectives with respect to the Medical Center's basic functions — teaching, research, and service— and that appropriate plans be developed for implementing and maintaining this balance.	**Not Determined.** The development of such a statement has been undertaken by the OU Medical Center in conjunction with the development of a long-range capital construction program, but such a statement has not yet been submitted to the State Regents.
Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the Medical Center be developed into a comprehensive educational center for the health sciences, and as rapidly as resources can be made available, its functions and programs be expanded to include a School of Public Health, School of Dentistry, and School of Allied Health Sciences.	**Substantially Implemented.** A School of Allied Health Science and School of Public Health have been established and funded. Planning funds have been allocated to the Medical Center for the establishment of a School of Dentistry in the near future.

Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the Medical Center complete a master plan for long-range campus development as quickly as possible. This plan should set forth the total mission of the Medical Center, identify land needs, provide for the "functional" location of new space in relation to existing buildings, and establish a system of priorities for construction. It is further recommended that a long-range capital budget program be developed which, with such federal and other funds as may be available, will enable the Medical Center to acquire needed land, construct needed facilities, and purchase needed new equipment.	**Implemented.** A long-range master plan for campus development has been completed for the Medical Center which proposed a three-phase construction program totaling $80,950,000. Funding for the first phase has been presented to the Oklahoma Legislature. Needed land is being acquired under an urban renewal project.
Recommendation 6: It is recommended that the organizational structure of the Medical Center be revised to conform with accepted management principles.	**Implemented.** The administrative structure has been revised to accomplish this recommendation.
Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the State Regents define the budget needs in a single unit for the Medical Center, both for current operations and capital improvements, and that funds be allocated accordingly, effective with the 1965-67 biennium.	**Implemented.** By formal action, the State Regents have combined the two budget agencies into a single agency, the OU Medical Center, and a unified budget is now developed and maintained for the Center.
Recommendation 8: It is recommended that the present policy of the Medical Center for handling professional income from welfare patients and certain other patients with pre-paid medical benefits be clarified in terms of whether it is personal income or is Educational and General Budget income.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit an evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 9: It is recommended that the Medical Center move toward a "strict full-time" faculty appointment plan. It is further recommended that faculty salaries adopted by the State Regents in developing the Medical Center budget recommendation be competitive with medical schools in the region which have comparable faculty salary plans.	**Not Implemented.** Faculty salaries to achieve this recommendation have not been possible because of the level of state appropriations. Current planning at the Medical Center would suggest that this recommendation should be modified.
Recommendation 10: It is recommended that the administration of the Medical Center, in cooperation with the State Regents' staff, conduct a systematic study of faculty work load and performance, and that such data be used to arrive at a meaningful definition of "full-time faculty."	**Not Implemented.** A committee has been appointed to initiate such a study, but as yet it has not been completed.
Recommendation 11: It is recommended that faculty at the Medical Center be extended the same staff benefit programs as those made available to the faculty on the main campus of the University of Oklahoma.	**Not Implemented.** Although staff benefit programs have recently been expanded at the Medical Center, the faculty still do not participate in the group hospitalization, major medical and accident insurance programs.

REPORT 6 (continued)

Recommendation 12: It is recommended that the Medical Center be encouraged to study (a) the health science personnel needs of the state, (b) a means of preparing physicians to provide family medical care, and (c) the best means for the "packaging and delivery" of health care in both urban and rural communities.	**Implemented.** The Medical Center has established a Health Intelligence Facility whose primary function has been to develop and maintain a data bank on health manpower needs in Oklahoma. Data are being compiled on seventeen health professions, with six additional professions being currently inventoried.
Recommendation 13: It is recommended that the fiscal budgeting and accounting procedures of the Medical Center be carefully reviewed and restructured in order to permit a more meaningful analysis and reporting of income and expenditures; and in order to achieve a more functional operating budget for the institution.	**Implemented.** A complete re-structuring of the fiscal budgeting and accounting procedures has been accomplished for the Medical Center.

REPORT 7 – EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that a statement of guiding principles and procedures be developed for use by the State Regents in considering changes in educational programs at institutions in the State System.	**Not Implemented.** The State Regents' staff is currently developing an "Educational Programs Manual" which will contain principles and procedures.
Recommendation 2: It is recommended that the State Regents develop, maintain, and periodically publish a current inventory of educational programs authorized to be offered at each institution in The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education.	**Substantially Implemented.** A "program" inventory of authorized programs is currently maintained. The list of authorized programs has been published one time, and will be published again in 1968, as part of a "counselors' guide."
Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the State Regents eliminate the unnecessary duplication of educational programs pointed out in this report, as well as other unnecessary duplication that may subsequently be identified.	**Partially Implemented.** Two programs — Home Economics and Industrial Arts — have been discontinued at the University of Oklahoma. Others are currently under re-study.
Recommendation 4: It is recommended that educational programs at the graduate level continue to be strengthened and expanded to meet the needs of an emerging industrial economy in Oklahoma.	**Partially Implemented.** The State Regents' formula for support of graduate education has been improved, and salaries of senior ranked faculty raised.
Recommendation 5: It is recommended that Oklahoma colleges and universities give greater emphasis to the design and conduct of innovative, experimental programs of teaching and learning.	**Partially Implemented.** Experimental program has been initiated at O.C.L.A. in Fine Arts. Through Title VI of the Higher Education Act, funds have been made available for TV experimentation.
Recommendation 6: It is recommended that new comprehensive, two-year colleges be established in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa metropolitan areas.	**Substantially Implemented.** Tentative approval has been given the establishment of these institutions, and funding legislation is currently pending in the Legislature.

Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the State Regents authorize a program of Dental Education at the University of Oklahoma Medical Center, and that the Thirty-First Oklahoma Legislature be requested to appropriate funds to implement the establishment and operation of a dental school to accommodate an entering freshman class of 64 students.	**Implemented.** Planning funds were allocated to the OU Medical Center for 1966-67, and will be provided again for 1967-68. A planning committee has been appointed to develop philosophy and program, and long-range building plans provide for the construction of facilities to accommodate the dental program.
Recommendation 8: It is recommended that for the present, Oklahoma should maintain its relationship with the Southern Regional Education Board, and that the state should seek to strengthen the concept of interstate and regional cooperation in higher education at every opportunity.	**Implemented.** Membership in the Southern Regional Education Board has been maintained, and additional legislative funds obtained to increase participation in exchange of dental students.
Recommendation 9: It is recommended that the names and titles of institutions in the State System be made consistent wih current institutional functions and programs.	**Not Implemented.** Names of several institutions have been changed, but these changes have not implemented the spirit of this recommendation.
Recommendation 10: It is recommended that Oklahoma colleges and universities limit the further proliferation of non-teaching programs and activities which are not clearly related or essential to the support of basic institutional functions and programs.	**Not Determined.** A study has not been made which would permit an evaluation of the extent of implementation of this recommendation.
Recommendation 11: It is recommended that a cooperative approach to study and planning in the areas of technical and vocational education be undertaken by representatives from public school education, vocational education, and higher education, in order to provide for the orderly integration of technical and vocational education into the mainstream of the educational system.	**Partially Implemented.** Special committee was appointed by the Governor and a study was made by private consulting firm. Legislation to implement the recommendations in this report are currently pending in the Oklahoma Legislature.
Recommendation 12: It is recommended that the number of institutions in the State System authorized to offer work through correspondence study be reduced to one. It is further recommended that the State Regents review the whole area of correspondence study to determine whether there is currently enough legitimate demand for this type of program to justify its continuation.	**Not Implemented.** No action has been taken to implement this recommendation.
Recommendation 13: It is recommended that colleges and universities in Oklahoma endeavor to establish a uniform title and numbering system for identifying like courses which are offered at institutions.	**Partially Implemented.** Junior colleges have developed a uniform numbering system, and uniform system has been developed in the fields of business, mathematics, and languages.

Recommendation 14: It is recommended that institutions in the State System work cooperatively toward the development of lower-division curricular patterns which will allow a student who has successfully completed the general education requirements for a bachelor's degree curriculum at one institution to transfer into the same curriculum at another institution without undue loss of time or academic credit.	**Not Implemented.** Faculty committees in some disciplines have worked on this problem, but a general curricular pattern has not yet been developed.
Recommendation 15: It is recommended that the State Regents give special attention to the coordination of programs in the areas of continuing education and off-campus education, including those programs offered for credit by institutions through the medium of educational television.	**Implemented.** With the assistance of a "Committee on Off-Campus Classes," the State Regents have developed and adopted a written policy for the approval of off-campus classes for college credit. The advisory committee meets semi-annually to review institutional requests and recommend programs to the State Regents.

REPORT 8 – GOALS

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the goals for Oklahoma higher education presented in this report be adopted and that the State System's total effort be directed toward their achievement.	**Substantially Implemented.** The statement of goals for Oklahoma higher education have been adopted and provide the basis for policy decisions made by the State Regents.
Recommendation 2: It is recommended that the State Regents, in cooperation with each institution, clarify and formally adopt a written policy statement with regard to each institution's functions.	**Partially Implemented.** This recommendation is being accomplished by the staff in close cooperation with each institution. Written statements of functions have been developed and approved by the State Regents for four institutions, and others are under study.
Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the vocational-technical function of the two-year colleges be broadened and strengthened in order to help produce the increasing number of technically trained workers required by Oklahoma industry in the decade ahead.	**Partially Implemented.** Additional funding has been recommended for the two-year institutions to strengthen vocational-technical education. Several technical programs have been added to the curriculum of these institutions.
Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the functions of organized research and graduate instruction leading to the doctorate remain the primary responsibility of the two state universities, and that the level of support for these two important functions be raised substantially.	**Substantially Implemented.** Additional funding for graduate education and research has been recommended for the two state universities. No other institutions have been authorized the addition of doctoral programs.
Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the functions of Central State College be broadened to include the provision of baccalaureate degree programs for new and emerging professions as such needs develop. It is further recommended that the graduate curriculum at this institution be broadened to include the Master of Arts and Master of Science degrees.	**Substantially Implemented.** Central State College has been given approval to initiate preliminary planning for the establishment of the MBA degree in Business Administration and the MA degree in English. This institution has contacted the North Central Association for their counsel with regard to their readiness for planning other programs at the Master's level.

Recommendation 6: It is recommended that the Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts continue to develop as an experimental college with a select curriculum for students of special promise who wish to accelerate their college learning experience.	**Implemented:** The revised curriculum to implement this recommendation has been authorized by the State Regents and was initiated by the institution beginning with the Fall of 1967.
Recommendation 7: It is recommended that the functions of Cameron State Agricultural College be expanded upward to include baccalaureate degree programs in the liberal arts and the sciences, with students to be admitted to the junior year in 1968, and to the senior year in 1969. It is further recommended that the institution be operated as a community senior college, that it continue to provide vocational-technical programs of less than baccalaureate degree length, and that its name be changed to more nearly reflect its expanded functions.	**Implemented.** The upper-division program for this institution has been developed by the institution and approved by the State Regents, and the institution will admit students to the junior year in 1968. A written statement of functions has been approved for this institution which provides that it will continue to provide vocational-technical programs. However, the institution's name has not yet been changed by the legislature to more nearly reflect its expanded functions.
Recommendation 8: It is recommended that Langston University continue to be developed as an institution of higher learning primarily concerned with meeting the needs of Oklahoma's economically and culturally disadvantaged youth who have both the potential and desire to obtain a college education.	**Implemented.** Admissions policies for this institution have been developed to be consistent with this recommendation, and the staff is currently developing a restatement of institutional functions which will reflect this unique role.
Recommendation 9: It is recommended that Oklahoma Military Academy continue to provide a military science program so long as the present military emergency exists and that as soon as the current crisis eases with regard to the procurement of commissioned officers, the need for this function be reexamined.	**Implemented.** A written statement of the functions of this institution has been approved by the State Regents which provides for the continued provision of a military science program, and a special committee is currently reexamining the future need for such a program in Oklahoma.
Recommendation 10: It is recommended that Southeastern State College and Panhandle A&M College be authorized to operate as community senior colleges, offering both terminal and baccalaureate degree programs.	**Implemented.** Admissions policies for these institutions have been developed to be consistent with this recommendation, and revised statements of functions are currently being developed by the staff.
Recommendation 11: It is recommended that the State Regents' admission policies for The Oklahoma State System of Higher Education be revised so as to be compatible with the preceding recommendations in this report, and that they become effective as of the beginning of the 1967-68 academic year.	**Implemented.** A revised statement of admissions standards has been adopted by the State Regents, to become effective July 1, 1968. The revised statement implements the recommendations contained in Report #8 of the Self-Study of Oklahoma Higher Education.
Recommendation 12: It is recommended that legislation be enacted for prescribing criteria for the establishment of municipal junior colleges, and that state support be provided those municipal junior colleges that meet the criteria.	**Implemented.** The First Session of the 31st Oklahoma Legislature adopted a "community junior college" bill authorizing the establishment and funding of such institutions, and state support was provided existing institutions for the 1967-68 Fiscal Year.

Achievement of Recommendations, Continued

Table 2 presents a summary of those 89 recommendations and rates the degree to which they have been implemented. Each recommendation was reviewed in terms of the extent of implementation as determined by documentation available to the State Regents. It should be pointed out that 14 of the recommendations were graded "not determined" because follow-up studies have not yet been made to ascertain if they have been achieved. It is possible that some of these have been partially, if not fully achieved. However, unless firsthand documentation was actually available as to the degree of implementation, recommendations were rated, "not determined."

Table 3 summarizes the extent of implementation of the 89 recommendations made in the Self-Study reports. Of the 89 recommendations, 30 have been fully implemented, 14 have been substantially implemented, and 17 have been partially implemented. Fourteen recommendations have not been implemented, and there was no basis for evaluating the extent of implementation of the remaining 14 recommendations.

Of the 89 recommendations, 75 could be appropriately evaluated as to the extent of their accomplishment. Of these 75 recommendations, 61 (81.3%) have been partially, substantially, or fully implemented and 14 (15.7%) have not yet been implemented. Of the 14 recommendations that have not yet been implemented, seven were directed to the State Regents themselves, five were directed to governing boards, and two require legislative action.

The greatest progresss in carrying out Self-Study recommendations has been made in connection with the latest report completed by the State Regents, *Goals for Oklahoma Higher Education*. All of the 12 recommendations made in this report have been partially implemented, and seven have been fully accomplished. Substantial progress has also been made in connection with the recommendations in the area of physical plant planning, with 14 of the 18 recommendations having been initiated and eight having been fully implemented. The least progress has been made in the area of selecting, retaining and utilizing higher education faculties.

TABLE 3

Extent of Implementation of Oklahoma Self-Study Recommendations

Self-Study Reports	Total Recommendations	Implemented				Not Implemented	Not Determined
		Fully	Substantially	Partially	Total		
Study #2: Faculty	14	1	1	2	(4)	3	7
Study #3: Enrollments	7	2	2	1	(5)	1	1
Study #4: Finance	11	4	2	3	(9)	1	1
Study #5: Buildings	17	8	3	3	(14)	1	2
Study #6: Medical Education	13	5	1	1	(7)	4	2
Study #7: Programs	15	3	2	5	(10)	4	1
Study #8: Goals	12	7	3	2	(12)	--	--
Totals	89	30	14	17	(61)	14	14

Chapter III

The Federal Government and State-Level Planning

Federal funds have become such a large part of higher education income they now exert a strong influence on every aspect of planning and the development of public policy for the state systems of higher education. The ready availability of federal funds not only is altering the program priorities of institutions, but it is also tempting them into courses of action not necessarily compatible with state-level planning. In a recent speech, Senator Fulbright expressed concern that the "munificence of Uncle Sam is leading universities to be more like businesses than centers of learning."

Because of state-level problems with respect to the funding of higher education, aspiring institutions believe they must seek the federal dollar as a matter of self-protection. If, for example, the federal policy is to encourage the development of nursing programs, or the development of a teacher corps, or research on problems of urban blight, the college or university is irresistably drawn into the competition for those funds even though such programs may be alien to its own functions. If the institution stands aloof, its faculty may be raided by those institutions that are successful in capturing the federal money. The natural reaction of an institution is to grab first and plan later.

In dispensing federal funds, the common practice of federal agencies is to deal directly with individual institutions, by-passing the state agency responsible for coordination and long-range planning. For example, a program for the training of adult and vocational education personnel may be funded at a particular institution in complete disregard of state-level planning for the division of program responsibility among institutions in the State System. The coordinating board is then confronted with a *fait accompli*. Too late, it learns via the newspaper that an institution has taken on a new function or established a new educational program. Little if any thought has been given to whether or not this particular program duplicates that of other programs in the State System, to the cost of

additional physical plant space that the added program will command, or to the state's commitment when federal funds are reduced or discontinued.

It is imperative to state-level master planning that some means be found to coordinate federal grants for categorical aid if institutional programs and activities are to be closely coordinated with long-range plans. One possible approach is suggested in Public Law 89-329, the Higher Education Act of 1965. A provision in that Act, not yet fully enforced, provides:

> "Each institution of higher education which receives a grant under this part shall periodically inform the state agency (if any) concerned with the educational activities of all institutions of higher education in the state in which such institution is located, of its activities under this part."[9]

Perhaps even better than reporting on institutional activities after the fact, would be the requirement of a certification by the state coordinating agency, in advance of the grant to the institution, that the program for which support was being requested was consistent with its assigned functions and programs.

State Coordination of Federal Programs

In more recent years, Congress has enacted a number of laws that have as their purpose the strengthening and expansion of educational programs in all states. These laws make federal funds available to the states to be allocated to institutions of higher learning, through "state commissions," for the support of the specific programs identified in the legislation. To participate, each state must designate an agency which is "broadly representative" of institutions of higher learning, and that agency must develop a state plan for the administration of the program and allocation of federal funds. This plan must conform to certain broad federal guidelines, and must be approved by the appropriate federal authority prior to the availability of federal funds to the state.

These programs have signaled a new direction for federal legislation in that they do provide for state-level coordination. In most instances, the state is left

[9]Public Law 89-329, "Higher Education Act of 1965," Title II, Part A, Section 208, *89th Congress*, H.R. 9567, November 8, 1965.

to determine the state agency that will serve as the state commission for the administration of the federal program, although federal guidelines sometimes suggest the appropriate coordinating agency. Because of the range of programs being encouraged by the federal government and the vested interests of pressure groups that have helped shape the federal legislation, only a minority of states have as many as four or five programs assigned to the legally constituted higher education coordinating board.

The states, and particularly the governors, are discovering that there is considerable potential for overlapping authority and responsibility when a variety of state agencies or boards are designated as coordinating agencies. It is inevitable that conflicts will occur among goals of the various coordinating agencies. The more dispersed the administration of these federal programs at the state level, the greater the risk of operating at cross-purposes and the more difficult it is to implement state-level master planning for higher education.

Oklahoma is more fortunate than most states in that it has an existing agency with a constitutionally assigned responsibility to serve as the coordinating board of control for higher education. Also, the majority of federal programs which involve state-level coordination of higher education in Oklahoma have been assigned to this agency. However, there have been some programs assigned to state institutions and agencies in Oklahoma that do not have legal authority or responsibility for the coordination of higher education.

Table 4 summarizes nine federal programs enacted in recent years which involve state-level coordination for their implementation. Of these nine programs, the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education has been designated as the state coordinating agency for five. The University of Oklahoma has been designated the coordinating agency for one program; Oklahoma State University for a second program; the State Board for Vocational Education a third; and an agency has not yet been designated for a fourth, the Education Professions Development Act.

TABLE 4

Federal Higher Education Programs Which Involve State-Level Coordination

PUBLIC LAW	TITLE	PROGRAM	DESIGNATED STATE COORDINATING AGENCY
88-204	Title I — Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	Grants for Construction of Academic Facilities	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
88-210	Vocational Education Act of 1963	Grants for Construction, Equipment and Operation of Vocational-Technical Programs	State Board for Vocational Education
89-329	Title I — Higher Education Act of 1965	Community Services and Continuing Education Programs	University of Oklahoma
89-329	Title IV, Part B — Higher Education Act of 1965	Higher Education Guaranteed Student Loan Program	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
89-329	Title VI, Part A — Higher Education Act of 1965	Undergraduate Instructional Equipment Grants	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
89-287	National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965	Vocational Education — Guaranteed Student Loan Program	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
89-182	State Technical Services Act of 1965	Community Technical Services	Oklahoma State University
88-204	Section 105 — Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 as amended by Section 3 of P.L. 89-752	Comprehensive Facilities Planning for Higher Education	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
89-329	Title V — Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, P.L. 90-35.	Education Professions Development and Training	Undesignated (Guidelines suggest the designation of State Department of Education)

Note: The above list of federal higher education programs is not intended to be comprehensive, but rather is illustrative of federal legislation relating to state-level coordination of higher education. Other laws such as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the Nurses Training Act of 1964, and the Library Services and Construction Act of 1966, also provide federal grants available to institutions to strengthen specific programs.

The Federal-State Partnership

It is now abundantly clear that the federal government has assumed a heavy obligation for the future support and improvement of higher education. The question of whether the federal government should play a major part in the enterprise of higher education no longer is moot. Beginning with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958, and reinforced with more recent federal legislation such as the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and the Higher Education Act of 1965, Congress has signaled a change of direction that is particularly significant with respect to state-level planning for higher education.

It is not the principle of federal support which poses a threat; that debate has, essentially, been settled. Rather, it is the scope and variety of new federal programs which are likely to overwhelm higher education. The somewhat haphazard manner in which the federal-state partnership is evolving does pose a particularly difficult challenge to those states that desire to develop long-range plans for the expansion and development of higher education opportunities.

Data Collection. One illustration of how the state can strengthen the federal-state partnership is in the collection of higher education statistics. Some years ago, the U.S. Office of Education established a National Center for Educational Statistics for the purpose of collecting and publishing uniform statistics on higher education. The Center has not yet achieved its full potential primarily because of resistance at the state and institutional level in adopting federal definitions of educational terms and because of the lengthy nature of the reporting forms.

By cooperating with the Center in the development of uniform definitions and the use of such data in state-level planning the work load of institutional research offices would not only be greatly reduced, but state coordinating agencies, legislative bodies, and other individuals interested in state-level planning would have the benefit of meaningful yardsticks by which institutional needs might be measured. Oklahoma should work with the U.S. Office of Education in the development of such a data collection system.

Oklahoma Consortium on Research Development. A second manner in which the state higher education planning agency can work cooperatively with

the federal education agency is in consortium arrangements organized for the purpose of developing inter-institutional cooperation. The Oklahoma Consortium on Research Development, established in July of 1967, is a voluntary association of 30 public and private institutions that are working cooperatively to develop inter- and intra-institutional research capability. The primary objective is to facilitate the utilization of research and research activities for the improvement of instruction. Through the Consortium, research capabilities of several institutions can be brought together for purposes of cooperative research and planning.

Conclusion

As the number of federally supported higher education programs expands, states eventually must provide for their close coordination. Where there is a diversity of state agencies administering these programs, there will inevitably be waste and conflict. Even if these agencies are not working at cross-purposes, they will likely have independent goals in mind, goals which inevitably will create tension and conflict. This will particularly be true in states, such as Oklahoma, which have a legally constituted coordinating agency for higher education. The assignment of federally supported higher education programs to inappropriate agencies constitutes a major barrier to state-level master planning. The partnership between federal and state government must be strengthened, and the role of state coordination clarified, if the future demands for higher education are to be met effectively and efficiently.

Chapter IV

Extending and Strengthening Oklahoma Higher Education

Oklahoma's future rests not only upon the development of its physical resources, but upon its intellectual resources as well. The state's economic future, its ability to progress even farther during the last three decades of the Twentieth Century, depends in large measure upon the competence of its teachers and researchers and upon the development of a reservoir of educated and trained manpower.

Central to the development of the state's intellectual resources is its system of higher education. Resting upon the broad base of elementary and secondary school education, higher education shoulders the primary responsibility for developing the skills and abilities that prepare people to be productive citizens, and for pushing outward the frontiers of new knowledge through research and creative thinking. Unless its institutions of higher education develop the capabilities and creative talents of its citizens, Oklahoma cannot hope to gain or maintain a position of national prominence.

There has never before been a time in Oklahoma's history when its system of higher education so obviously needs a clear sense of direction and a firm dedication of its educational leadership to the pursuit of common goals. Higher education, already greatly underfinanced, faces enrollment increases of a magnitude not yet fully comprehended by its political leaders. New dimensions of knowledge, mechanization, automation, and technology emphasize the growing importance of higher education. If Oklahoma is to achieve its potential for economic, industrial, and cultural expansion, it must greatly strengthen and improve both the quantity and quality of its higher education system.

Oklahoma higher education is at the crossroads of mediocrity and greatness, and time is of the essence. The state is currently confronted with two major decisions; and the choices that are made will inevitably determine down which road the state will move. These problems are (1) the level of finance which is

established and maintained for higher education, and (2) the manner in which higher education utilizes its resources.

Financing Higher Education

No state has, nor will it ever have, unlimited resources with which to achieve excellence in all of the functions and programs which the people have delegated to state government. Given the fact of limited fiscal resources, the people's representatives are vested with the responsibility for determining those public programs which will be given the highest priority. If a state chooses to give its greatest emphasis to welfare, or highways, or some other area of public responsibility, the people must recognize that it is not realistic to reach for excellence in its institutions of higher education. If a state expects its system of public higher education to be excellent, that expectation must be mirrored in the priority assignment of the state's financial resources to this segment of public responsibility.

Utilization of Resources

Similarly, a state system of higher education must not expect to be excellent in all areas of endeavor. Even with priority consideration, the legislature will not likely be able to fund a state system's budget needs at a level which would permit excellence in all its educational programs. Within the system of higher education, decisions should be made with respect to the appropriate allocation of functions and programs, and to the assignment of priorities to these functions and programs in the allocation of resources.

Not only should priorities be assigned certain programs and resources allocated accordingly, but these resources must be expended efficiently and effectively. A high level of expenditure for an educational program does not, *per se*, mean quality. The resources must be used wisely in order to bring together the ingredients for quality—faculty, students and facilities—and in order to maintain the public's confidence and continued support.

However, these peaks of excellence will not likely be permitted to develop unless all segments of higher education are supported at a reasonable level. It is

neither politically feasible nor educationally sound to build a few programs at the expense of the elimination of other needed programs. Each discipline is interdependent; each is supported and complemented by knowledge in other areas. For example, it would not be possible to build an outstanding program in the field of medical education without strong supportive programs in the biological sciences, in the physical sciences, and in the social sciences. It would not be possible to build an outstanding program in Sociology without strong supportive programs in Anthropology, Archeology, Economics, and Social Psychology.

Goals for Higher Education

The long-range goals that individuals and social organizations set for themselves are all-important since they not only give meaning and direction, but also serve as a yardstick to measure success or failure. Where there are no goals there can be no adherence to principle, no consistency in behavior, no means of discriminating between good and bad. It is axiomatic that an individual who embarks upon a journey without a predetermined destination will not know when he has arrived. In like manner, organizations and social institutions without generally recognized and accepted goals will be unable to measure either their progress or ultimate effectiveness. Following are restated the State Regents' goals for Oklahoma higher education.

Goals Related to Individual Needs

Goal 1: Appropriate opportunities for education beyond the high school should be available to all who seek and can profit therefrom.

Goal 2: Those responsible for education beyond the high school in Oklahoma should attempt to identify, conserve and develop the talents of all worthy youth.

Goal 3: Higher education in Oklahoma should provide opportunities for adullts to keep abreast of new developments in the arts and sciences and tlhe professions.

Goal 4: Higher education, in concert with emerging institutions in Oklahoma, should provide both training and retraining opportunities in vocational-technical education.

Goals Related to Social Needs

Goal 5: Higher education should contribute to the economic growth of the state.

Goal 6: Higher education should contribute to the social and moral well-being of the state and of the nation.

Goal 7: Higher education should promote the cultural development of Oklahoma.

Goals Related to the Nature of Higher Education

Goal 8: There should be a systematic division of responsibility among Oklahoma institutions of higher learning.

Goal 9: Higher education in Oklahoma should constantly strive to achieve the highest possible levels of excellence.

Goal 10: Graduate instruction and research of high quality should be provided and adequately supported.

Goal 11: Higher education in Oklahoma should be sensitive to and receptive to new concepts, developments and procedures.

Goals Related to Effectiveness and Support

Goal 12: Educational institutions in Oklahoma should strive to achieve a high level of efficiency and effectiveness.

Goal 13: The state should provide the fullest possible support for higher education.

Future Directions of Higher Education

A long-range plan for higher education is essentially a compilation of a series of proposed changes, the sum total of which presumably will, when implemented, result in the achievement of desired goals. The nature of highest education is such, however, that a long-range plan must be implemented step by step. An institution of higher education is a complex entity whose control, management and daily operation is vested in a variety of boards, individuals and quasi-legal bodies. There is great built-in resistance to change, particularly change that is suggested by forces external to the institution itself. This resistance to external influence, while a source of great strength to the academic community, does complicate the state-level planning and coordinating function.

As each recommendation is implemented, it sets in motion a chain of action and reaction which may not always be predictable, or which may not lead in the direction of desired goals. Further, institutional resistance tends to compound with each step. The net result is that periodic modifications and revisions must be made in a long-range plan if it is to remain sensitive to changing needs and conditions. Long-range planning is necessarily a continuous process.

The State Regents plan to give continuing emphasis and encouragement to the full implemetation of recommendations contained in the eight Self-Study reports. The accomplishment of these recommendations not only will strengthen Oklahoma higher education, but will place post-secondary education opportunities within the reach of all who want it and who are willing to make the necessary personal effort to obtain it.

In addition to the 89 Self-Study recommendations, the State Regents have adopted the following statements intended to provide further direction and thrust to their long-range planning, and to guide them as they consider and develop public policy in the field of higher education.

Standards of Education

1. The present policy of "selective access" to state institutions of higher education should be continued, with each institution's admissions policy made

compatible with its assigned functions and programs. Admissions policies should be directed toward encouraging the student to seek an educational environment which will provide him with the best opportunity to produce to the maximum of his abilities.

a. Junior colleges should continue to remain open-door institutions, accessible to all high school graduates, and should be encouraged and assisted in expanding and strengthening their vocational-technical and adult education programs.

b. Senior colleges should plan to admit high school graduates who intend to complete at least the baccalaureate degree, and their admissions policies should be compatible with their assigned functions and programs. Those institutions that have been authorized to provide technical programs of less than baccalaureate degree length should have admissions policies somewhat lower than those senior colleges not assigned this function.

c. State universities should plan to concentrate primarily upon upper-division undergraduate programs, graduate and professional programs, and research, with a decreasing percentage of their total student body to be lower-division undergraduate students. This should be achieved by raising the admission standards of the state universities above that of the state senior colleges.

2. The state should seek to identify, develop and utilize the capacities and aptitudes of all its citizens. Particular effort should be given to the identification of qualified Oklahoma youths with exceptional academic ability, and programs should be developed which will encourage the appropriate education and full utilization of this talent.

a. A "talent search" program should be developed by the State Regents to encourage the full utilization of educational talent in Oklahoma.

b. Scholarship programs should be developed to assist students of high academic promise who want to go to college but lack the financial ability to do so.

c. A handbook on Oklahoma higher education should be prepared by the State Regents for use by high school students, parents, and counselors which provides detailed information about each institution's functions, educational programs, and other information pertinent to the selection of the institution best fitted to the student's own abilities and interests.

3. Every institution of higher education should endeavor to strengthen and improve its counseling program, with particular attention given to improving the retention of academically able college students who are discontinuing their formal education prematurely.

4. A uniform transfer policy for the State System should be adopted which will facilitate the inter-institutional transfer of college students without undue loss of time or academic credit. Such a policy should provide a "recovery process" for students who have been given academic suspension from an institution and who want to enter programs at junior colleges which are more in keeping with their aptitudes and needs.

5. Effort should be directed toward the development of a "college-level examination program" for Oklahoma to facilitate the transfer of students from technical to academic institutions, and to permit the establishment of graduation standards for the various baccalaureate degree programs. Not until better methods of measuring educational attainment are developed will it be possible for the State Regents to fulfill their responsibilities with respect to the establishment of graduation standards.

Institutional Functions and Programs

6. Continued emphasis should be given to the redefinition of functions and authorized programs of institutions in the State System. Not until this is accomplished can the next step be taken in the development of the State System's admission and retention policies.

7. Each institution should continue to be required to obtain the State Regents' approval prior to adding, deleting, or substantially modifying authorized

functions and programs. Following the redefinition of functions and programs of each institution, the institution should be extended general authority to add, delete, or modify courses which comprise authorized programs.

a. The State Regents should develop written policies with respect to principles and procedures for review and approval of institutional requests for function and program expansion. The procedure should include provision for an advisory committee drawn from the academic community.

b. Control of course proliferation and inefficiency should be maintained by the State Regents through an inventory and annual analysis of course changes made by each institution in the State System. If an institution does not exercise responsible administrative control of the expansion or scheduling of courses, the State Regents should request appropriate reports and explanations as part of the budget building procedures.

c. The State Regents should continue to require each institution to obtain prior approval of each course offered in off-campus programs.

d. A uniform course title and numbering system should be developed for all institutions in the State System.

8. Programs of continuing education should be expanded, with particular emphasis upon the retraining of displaced workers and of adults wishing to upgrade themselves.

9. The State Regents should be the legally designated state agency to administer all federal programs which are related to activities appropriate to their legal functions, which require intercollegiate coordination, or which require a state plan for participation.

10. The junior colleges for Tulsa and Oklahoma City recommended in Self-Study Report #7 should be made operational as quickly as possible. These new institutions should be authorized to offer comprehensive programs which include academic, technical, vocational, terminal, and adult education programs

11. All institutions of higher education supported wholly or in part by direct legislative appropriations are part of the State System. With the allocation of state-appropriated funds to municipal junior colleges during the 1967-68 Fiscal Year, these institutions became integral parts of the State System and should, therefore, be included in all future planning and deliberations by the State Regents.

12. Although private institutions do not operate under the authority of the State Regents, it is in the public interest to strengthen and support them in appropriate ways. In making function and program decisions, the State Regents should continue to endeavor to minimize the geographic duplication of programs that are being provided satisfactorily by these institutions.

13. A major objective of the State Regents should be to continue to strengthen and expand resources for graduate study at the doctoral level. The two public institutions authorized to offer doctoral work are the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University.

    a. Additional programs of study at the Master's degree level should be developed only in response to clearly documented needs and in accordance with appropriate standards of quality.

    b. The State Regents, in cooperation with the two universities, should identify one or two areas of graduate education in which each institution wishes particularly to excel. These areas should recognize not only existing strengths but also the economic and social needs of Oklahoma.

14. Community junior colleges should develop a system of ranking full-time faculty members so that academic competence can be recognized and appropriately remunerated.

15. The School of Dentistry, previously authorized by the State Regents, to be established at the University of Oklahoma Medical Center should be established as quickly as possible and the program for assisting dental students through the Southern Regional Education Board should be phased out of existence. In the interim, the program to assist Oklahoma students attending

dental schools outside the state should be revised so as to provide a more equitable distribution of funds to all such students.

16. The State Regents and the newly created State Board for Vocational Education should work cooperatively in an effort to meet the state's trained manpower shortage as quickly and efficiently as possible.

Financing Higher Education

17. The State Regents should replace the existing formula for determining institutional operating budget needs with a new procedure which is more directly related to actual costs of instructional programs.

    a. High priority should be given to the development of a centralized data system of higher education which integrates all present data on students, programs, faculty, facilities and resources, into a unified system. These data should be utilized in the development of both capital improvement and current operating budget requests.

    b. The budget-building procedure should recognize and provide additional support for those programs in which particular strength is desired.

    c. The allocation and allotment of funds and institutional budgeting procedures should be modified so that the requesting and expending of institutional funds will be carried out in a consistent manner.

    d. The allocation of state-appropriated funds should be based upon actual enrollment rather than the projected enrollment used in the budget build-up, thus eliminating inequities resulting from enrollment projections that do not materialize.

18. Following the revision of the national manual on budgeting and accounting, the state manual for Oklahoma for fiscal budgeting and accounting in the State System should be completed and published.

19. Continued emphasis should be given to the improvement of faculty salaries in an effort to achieve and maintain salary rates that are comparable at like-type institutions in the region.

20. In order that equal educational opportunities not be denied any qualified youth who desires an education, the level of student charges at institutions in the State System should be maintained at the lowest possible level consistent with the cost of providing a quality program of instruction. Increased student charges should be viewed as a last resort in seeking additional sources of revenue.

21. The allocation of capital outlay funds should continue to be made on the basis of need as determined by the size and scope of the assigned functions and programs of each institution.

    a. Attention should continue to be given to the development of procedures designed to increase the intensity of use of existing facilities through such means as extending their use throughout the hours of the day, days of the week, and months of the year.

22. Higher education should be given higher priority among the major needs of Oklahoma. The level of support recommended by the State Regents in their operating budget request must be achieved before it will be possible to achieve excellence in any area of higher education.